

Still, Abu-Jamal deserved his day in court as would any other American accused of a crime. He got his day in court. He deserved competent counsel, and he got that too. He deserved an opportunity to appeal, and he got it. In fact, after the matter turned from a criminal matter to an issue of justice and to a political cause, he received some of the best counsel in the country and they filed appeal after appeal, all of which were rejected.

But that didn't stop Mr. Adegbile from claiming that Abu-Jamal was a victim of racism and a corrupt judicial system. For Mr. Adegbile, Abu-Jamal's case was apparently an opportunity to focus more on a political agenda than the case at hand. Abu-Jamal's guilt or innocence was not really the concern.

Debo Adegbile is free to make any arguments he sees fit about the First and Second Amendments. He is free to turn the murder of a police officer into a cause to advance a political agenda. When he does so, I think it says something about his judgment and it says something about his fitness to lead the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.

The Department of Justice and police forces around our country should be working together to ensure that minority rights are respected and that civil rights abuses are punished. In my view, this nominee would only make that work more difficult. As the Fraternal Order of Police wrote in a letter to President Obama, if Mr. Adegbile is confirmed it will serve to "exacerbate growing division and distrust" between the Civil Rights Division—which is charged with securing our most basic freedoms—and the men and women of law enforcement who defend those freedoms by putting their lives on the line every day.

I think we can and should do better with a nominee who can work with the Fraternal Order of Police and other law enforcement around the country in ensuring that our most basic freedoms are secured through the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division.

For these reasons I oppose the nomination of Mr. Adegbile to this position, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

UKRAINE CRISIS

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I have been discussing the Ukraine crisis with my constituents and a number of Indiana media outlets for the last few days. Virtually every interview or conversation on the subject includes this question: What difference does this make to us here in Indiana? What American interests are at stake? These are legitimate questions, and they deserve an answer because before we commit America to address potential conflicts, we need to describe and define just what our interest is and why we should be engaged.

In this conflict we are not talking about the use of military force, but we are thinking about and talking about and should be examining other measures that can influence the outcome of a crisis situation that could have significant consequences for the American people.

If we can't answer that question and we can't address that with a compelling answer, then we should not get engaged. But if we can determine a compelling answer and reason why we should engage in some form, then we need to make sure the American people know why it is we are renewing this and why this is important.

Ukraine is 5,000 miles away. The trade between our two countries is minuscule and shrinking. Only 30 percent of the Ukrainian population shares our Christian faith or identifies with any faith. Ukraine is the source of no energy or crucial materials. Indeed, the country is a source of instability and corruption. So why should Americans and Hoosiers care about what is happening to a country 5,000 miles away? Well, let me suggest some reasons and then perhaps some suggestions as to what would be the best way for us to help influence this crisis situation in a way that is positive for our country and, frankly, for Western democracy and for the world.

The first and most obvious reason we should take this seriously is the central lesson of history: Conflicts—even catastrophes—sometimes grow from small beginnings. Most know that the assassination of an imperial relative in a Balkan town in 1914 led to the death by violence of 37 million people—World War I. We also know that the cataclysm of World War II began with the stealth invasion of Austria and Czechoslovakia in 1938. Despite warnings as to what this might lead to, we saw a tragic loss of tens of millions of people in World War II. This is eerily reminiscent of Russia's moves on Crimea last week.

A history lesson closer in time is taught by the Balkan wars of the 1990s. When Serb gunboats shelled Dubrovnik, a Croatian city, in 1992, the world—and most especially Croatia's European neighbors—did exactly nothing. Our own Secretary of State said repeatedly that there were no American interests at stake. Before that view was changed and NATO eventually intervened 3 years later, more than 100,000 people had been slaughtered.

If the international community had had the collective wisdom and leadership—and, frankly, courage and guts—to simply tell Belgrade that civilian European population centers are no longer shelled in modern Europe, all of that suffering could have been prevented and our own Armed Forces could have stayed in their barracks and in their homes.

We should draw from such lessons so that we need not confront later the question of whether we should inter-

vene militarily in a Ukrainian civil war or a war between Ukraine and Russia. Instead, we must confront now the choice we have of doing nothing and letting Putin have his way or leading an American and an international response to impose penalties on Putin's Russia so that he comes to his senses.

A second and related American interest is in the stability of the European continent itself. Ukraine is not an obscure sideshow. It is comprised of remnants of two European empires and deeply embedded in the integrated structure, identity, economy, and culture of Europe as a whole. Disaster there threatens a very great deal in Europe, a continent we have spent 100 years, trillions of dollars, and hundreds of thousands of lives to stabilize. European security and stability have been at the very heart of our foreign and defense policy for an entire century. If American foreign policy and American strategic interests in the world have any permanent core, it is that interest in Europe's well-being.

Ukraine's conflict with the remnants of Soviet-style aggression portends serious threats to the rest of Russia's border lands, nearly all of which were long dominated by Red Army presence and force. The Baltic states must be alarmed right now. If we do nothing, they could panic.

Poland has already summoned NATO councils to consider consequences for its own security and therefore for the security of the alliance. Georgia painfully reflects that the paltry international response to its own war with Russia five years ago surely emboldened Putin in this latest adventure.

In other words, we could be looking at a Sudetenland moment. We hope that is not the case.

It is no secret that Putin has imperial ambitions motivated by his pathological insecurities and a quest to restore lost glories. These are dangerous delusions that, if not confronted firmly, could come to threaten us all.

Beyond history and beyond the threats to continental security instability, I am even more concerned about America's place in the world and how inaction will further harm it. Abroad, we are increasingly seen as a spent force, exhausted by interminable wars, politically divided and inert, financially strained, and floundering without firm, articulate, determined leadership. This is a bleak, incomplete picture of my country that more than anything else makes me determined to be part of an effort to correct this perception of America.

In many ways, we can potentially look at the Ukrainian crisis as an opportunity. We have a chance now to summon our collective will and impose costs for Putin's irresponsible behavior. We have many robust capabilities to reward those who join us in responsible, mutually productive cooperation in managing world affairs and in punishing those who do not.

This is the moment to demonstrate our return to the leadership role that the realities of this harsh world have long imposed upon us. This situation, this crisis which we now face in Ukraine, can be a moment to demonstrate our return to a leadership role desperately needed by this tortured world where the realities of this harsh world have long imposed upon us.

It is in our national interest, in my opinion, to lead the world toward solutions that we know are best for us all. No other country can manage it. We have seen that. Without that management, we risk things that could harm us in many ways and continue to undermine our role in this world in providing for peace and stability.

For these reasons, tomorrow I will introduce a sense-of-the-Senate resolution articulating some of the steps I think we and the President should consider together. None of these steps involve military force or the preparation for using such force. Now is not the time to add to the violence but, rather, to remove the use of force by all parties as an option.

I hope the resolution will contribute to the search for both a bipartisan, unified government approach to problem-solving and an international consensus on firm actions that will change Russia's behavior. I am saying that we should stand united as Americans with a single message and a single voice led by our leader which shows we are resolute in standing together—hopefully with our European allies and others who want to join us—in condemning the actions taken by Putin and Russia and in offering and proposing meaningful sanctions and measures that will bring the reality of Russia's actions straight to Putin's desk and hopefully cause him to rethink his strategy.

The resolution will commit the Senate to work urgently with the President to identify a package of economic sanctions and other measures to compel Putin to remove armed forces from Ukrainian territory and return that territory to full Ukrainian sovereign control.

Further, I will suggest that we construct a complete comprehensive plan to isolate Putin's Russia from the community of nations. We seek a consensus on such a plan with our friends and allies—everyone who wants to see a sovereign Ukraine, secure within its own border, able to seek its own destiny on its own terms. That is the right of every sovereign nation.

My resolution will also call upon the President to consider a number of measures to isolate and sanction Russia.

We could reschedule a meeting of the G-8 nations to take place as soon as possible, at which meeting the participating nations should seriously consider a U.S. proposal to formally expel Russia.

The United States should propose to NATO that the alliance immediately suspend operation of the Russian-

NATO council. The Russian military and diplomatic representation at NATO should be expelled. A close relationship with Russian's defense officials during a time when that country has invaded and occupied a neighbor contravenes the founding purpose of NATO. How could we possibly meet on a Russian-NATO council basis when Russia has invaded and occupied a neighbor?

The President should ask the leadership of FIFA to reconsider its decision to place World Cup 2018 matches in Russia and instead award these games to a more worthy alternative country. Russia has just celebrated the Sochi Olympics. I think we got the real measure of President Putin, a former KGB lieutenant colonel, as to what his real intentions are—it is not to bring more good will and more confidence in that country.

The United States could work with other members of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe—the OSCE—to deploy monitors in Ukraine to help confirm that the security of the Russian-speaking population is not threatened. This pretext for Russian aggression must be removed to international satisfaction.

Senate leadership could dispatch a congressional delegation led by OSCE Commissioners to visit Ukraine and bolster OSCE's involvement in addressing this crisis. Another option would be the United States working with OSCE and German Chancellor Angela Merkel to support her proposal to create an OSCE contact group to pursue dispute resolution and mediate direct negotiations between the Ukrainian and Russian Governments.

The United States should not maintain the current status of diplomatic relations with Russia at current levels. We could downgrade our diplomatic representation while retaining its efficacy by announcing that we will not send our new Ambassador to Moscow. Instead, we could dispatch an experienced professional diplomat to Ukraine to serve as charge d'affaires to handle the crisis. We could also reduce the diplomatic presence to focus exclusively on crisis management, not business as usual. We could close consulates general and require Russia to make reciprocal steps to close their consulates in the United States.

I believe we in Congress should expand the Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act to sanction the Ministry of Defense officials in the chain of command responsible for this invasion, the Duma leadership responsible for rubberstamping it, and Crimean officials complicit in its execution.

The United States should also consider sanctions that might serve to convince more segments of the Russian population that their government is taking irresponsible steps contrary to the people's interests. To this end, we should suspend and could suspend Russia's eligibility for H-2B temporary or seasonal work visas.

This is just a menu of suggestions of actions we can take, actions that I think would impose upon Russia a cost for their brazen attempt to intercede in the affairs of a sovereign nation to, under the most flimsiest of pretenses, invade a country under the pretext that its citizens there, or those who favor support for Russia, are under some type of lethal threat. That is not the case. It has not been demonstrated, and it has not been proven.

Now is the time to act—to act quickly and act together. Our leverage is our leadership. We need to take up that powerful tool and show Putin that he has misjudged us. Now is the time for the United States to reassert its leadership in the world by taking direct action—not through military action but through a menu of measures designed to bring Russia to its senses and designed to protect the sovereign interests of those nations that are seeking to align with the West in a Democratic way. We need that leadership from the President. We need that support from this Congress in a bipartisan measure. And we need to speak with a united voice, hopefully with our European partners and others throughout the Western world and the free world, to send a message that Russia cannot ignore and to impose a measure of costs that will impact that country's economy and impact the decision that has to be made by their President.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO TEQUIA DELGADO

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senate is a place where we make friends. We have our differences on policy, but we truly are a Senate family. It is just not that way with Democrats who work in the Senate, it is also the Republicans. When we work together, which we do outside the view of most of the public, we work well together.

One of the troubling things for me—I am sure it is for all of us—is when someone who is a part of the family leaves—especially it applies when you feel so close to the family member. Today, the Democratic cloakroom, the nerve center of the Senate and the entire Senate community, says goodbye to a dedicated staffer Tequia Delgado.

I and we congratulate her on her new role as a member relations advisor for the White House. After graduating from Southern Illinois University in Carbondale, IL, Tequia started her Senate career as a staff assistant in my office.